



REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-24 are pending. Claims 6 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

I. Drawings

The drawings stand objected to as failing to show the features of the claims. In response, Applicants provide herewith, a Replacement drawing page (Attachment), showing different molding shapes in, e.g., Figs. 2-4. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Specification

The specification stands objected to for failing to explain how a single molding can have both a quarter round face and, simultaneously, a base shoe face, "if the base shoe face has a higher profile height than profile width." Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to Paragraphs [0024] - [0027] (of the corresponding Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0166526), wherein such dimensions are described as being "not limited," and which "can be variable." For example, the molding can be substantially rounded (similar to a typical quarter round) on a first face, and somewhat squared (similar to a typical base shoe) on another face. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

III. GB '665

Claims 1-8, and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or as being unpatentable over GB 2096665A. The Office Action asserts this reference teaches or renders obvious each feature of the rejected claims. In light of the amendments to the claims, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the faces have the same shape. In contrast, as recognized by the Office Action, the cove molding 5 of GB '665 has faces which differ from each other in shape. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits GB '665 does not teach each feature of claim 1.

As the purpose of the invention of the reference is to have different shapes, each shape providing a different purpose, GB ‘665 teaches away from modifying the cove molding 5 described therein such that the decorative faces have the same shape.

A. Claim 2

Claim 2 recites the molding product includes particle board, HDF, MDF or veneered lumber. The Office Action acknowledges GB ‘665 fails to teach such a feature, but nevertheless asserts would have been obvious, based on “design choice.” Applicant respectfully disagrees as this reference alone fails to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to do what the present inventor has done. For example, even if it would have been obvious to form the cove tile 5 out of a wood product (an assertion with which Applicant disagrees), this reference neither teaches nor suggests to form the cove tile 5 of GB ‘665 out of any of the particular materials recited by this claim. The Office Action has also failed to identify what “design choice” would direct one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the cove molding 5 of GB ‘665 to achieve the presently claimed invention.

B. Claims 3-6

Claims 3-6 recite specific materials for use as the decorative faces of the reversible molding. The Office Action asserts it would have been a matter of design choice to modify the product of the reference to include one or more of the materials recited by the claim. Applicants respectfully disagree, as neither this nor any other cited reference teaches or suggests to do what the inventors have done, provide a reversible molding having foil, laminate, veneer, paint, stain, and/or clear protective material.

C. Claim 8

Claim 8 recites that the molding is in the shape of a base shoe. The Office Action asserts it would have been obvious to modify the cove molding 5 of the reference “to be smaller,” such a

modification would not necessarily produce the base shoe of claim 5, as merely changing the size of the cove molding of the reference would produce a small cove molding, not a base shoe.

IV. WoodFloorsOnline

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10 and 12 stand rejected as being anticipated by a reference identified as WoodFloorsOnline.com. However, in light of the amendments, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Specifically, claim 1 (from which the remaining claims depend) has been modified to recite that the molding has two faces of the same shape. As recognized by the Office Action, the moldings of this reference have two different face shapes. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 recites the molding product includes particle board, HDF, MDF or veneered lumber. There is neither a teaching or suggestion that such wood product is particle board, HDF, MDF or veneered lumber. In contrast, the moldings of WoodFloorsOnline are solely described as being hardwood moldings. Thus, such moldings cannot include particle board, HDF, MDF or veneered lumber, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the finished products described by WoodFloorsOnline to include such materials.

V. New Claims

New claims 14-23 are supported by the originally filed claims, Fig. 1 and the specification at, e.g., page 5, last full paragraph and page 23, first full paragraph, and further distinguish the present invention from the cited art. No new matter has been entered.

Claim 14 is directed to reversible moldings wherein at least one of the faces is a laminate, a foil or a veneer. As none of the cited references teach or suggest such a feature, and the additional claims further distinguish over the cited references, Applicant respectfully submits new claims 14-23 are allowable.

AMENDMENT
Page 9

U.S. Appl. No. 10/748,852
Atty. Docket Nol TPP 31700

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections and passage of the application to issue. If any fee is necessary to make this paper timely and/or complete, such fee may be deducted from deposit account no. 19-4375.

Respectfully submitted,

TPR Res. No. 45,047
TPR Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/EPR/mat
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 31700

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: December 12, 2006

AMENDMENT

Page 10

U.S. Appl. No. 10/748,852

Atty. Docket Nol TPP 31700

ATTACHMENT - Replacement Drawing Page